



P1028 (16221RRUS02)

PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Yuan, Wei

Serial No.: 10/642,256

Filed: August 15, 2003

For: Method for Providing Media Communication Across Firewalls

Group Art Unit: 2439

Examiner: Tolentino, Roderick

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED JANUARY 31, 2011**

In response to the Office Action mailed January 31, 2011, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the following Response. This application was subject to a prior Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, which reversed a prior anticipation rejection based on the Trossen [20030212764] reference.

Upon remand to the Examiner, the Examiner issued another rejection of the claims based on the same Trossen reference, which was previously found by the Patent Office Appeal Board to be distinguishable from the claimed invention. The Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in light of the present arguments.


07/05/2011 SDENB0B3 00000021 141315 10642256

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 01 FC:1202 312.00 DA  
02 FC:1201 220.00 DA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date:

June 29, 2011

  
Amy Kasper

New Claims 21 to 26 have been added to the Application, and this Response is filed with the fees for an additional independent claim (over three) and an additional six claims over the twenty claim limit. This Response is filed with a request for two month extension of time request, with the appropriate extension fee payment.

## **INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

1. Claims 1-13 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rodgers [US Publ. No. 2002/0026478] in view of Trossen et al [20030212764] (hereafter “Trossen”).

2. Claims 14, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rodgers [US Publ. No. 2002/0026478] in view of Trossen et al [20030212764] (hereafter “Trossen”) in further view of Wu et al [2003021809] (hereafter “Wu”).